

8233-12.WAM.464014

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 21 2007

REMARKS

In the Advisory Action dated May 10, 2007, the Examiner refused to enter the proposed amendments made in Applicant's response dated April 23, 2007 because the amendments presented therein raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search and are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. Accordingly, Applicant hereby submits a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) for consideration of the April 23, 2007 response, the substance of which is recited herein.

In the Office Action dated February 22, 2007, claims 1-38 have been examined and are currently pending. Claims 1-38 were rejected in the Final Office Action as discussed below. Claims 1, 4, 8-10, 13-14 have been amended and claims 17-38 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added to this application. In view of the following, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

**Independent Claim 1**

Claims 1-38 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0019542 A1 to Fuchs et al. (hereinafter "Fuchs") and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0027368 A1 to Snyder et al. (hereinafter "Snyder").

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for suggesting an amendment with respect to certain elements of the claims to further define their functionality. In order to comply with this request and place the claims in condition for allowance, Applicant amended Claim 1 to more specifically define the data source, data elements, and multi-dimensional cube. In light of these amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that Fuchs does not anticipate or make obvious all of the elements

---

AMENDMENT WITH FILING OF REQUEST FOR  
CONTINUED EXAMINATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.114  
Application Serial No. 10/802,442  
Atty. Docket No. 8233-12  
Page 5 of 8

8233-12.WAM.464014

of the currently amended claims and requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the case passed to issue.

Turning to the current rejections, the Examiner asserts that Fuchs teaches data elements, as required by the claim, to be "elements found in a timesheet page application." These elements are described by Fuchs, as cited by the Examiner, to include predefined elements, such as employee number, employee name, work date, etc. Claim 1, in amended form, requires "undefined" data elements, which is contrary to the "predefined" elements of the Fuchs system in that undefined data elements do not have a predefined classification or type included within their associated data source.

Additionally, the Examiner has asserted that "the web server is the 'data source' from which the predefined data elements are being mapped from." Applicant has amended claim 1 further to highlight the "unstructured" and "electronic" nature of the data source. In contrast to the unstructured nature of the data source required by the amended claim, it is inherent that the web server of Fuchs provides the predefined data elements in a structured format to the computing device in order to foster efficient data entry/processing. For example, Fuchs describes using XML or HTML formatted pages in accordance with the XSL specification to maintain a separation between style and content. In this way, the Fuchs system is able to maintain the structure of the data being passed between the web server running the timesheet reporting application and the computing device where the user enters the data into specific data fields. As such, the web server cannot be said to be an "unstructured data source," in that it lacks a data structure or does not contain data readily extractable for use by a computer, as required by the unstructured limitation of the claim.

8233-12.WAM.464014

Finally, the Examiner asserted that Fuchs described the building of a multi-dimensional cube when “[t]he user of a computing device builds and generates the timesheet application by providing data for the predefined data elements of the timesheet application.” Applicant has amended claim 1 to further define the specific structure of the multi-dimensional cube to be an OLAP cube. This structure, which is known in the art, is analogous to a multidimensional database which stores data more like a multi-dimensional spreadsheet rather than a relational database. An OLAP cube allows different views of the data to be quickly displayed without reprocessing. Fuchs does not describe this specific structure or functionality with respect to the computing device 101 or any other element of the timesheet reporting system. Additionally, the process of mapping the data “based upon at least one user-defined dimension of the plurality of data elements identified from at least one of the data sources” further describes who identifies the dimensions which make up the various perspectives of the OLAP cube structure and that those dimensions are identified from the data sources by a user who is able to recognize them, such as by way of the data sources formatting.

As such, even assuming that the “computing device 101”, as cited by the Examiner, is the OLAP cube as required by the amended claim, then the data provided by the user of computing device for the data fields of the timesheet does not constitute a “user-defined dimension” as currently required. Further, the user supplied data does not come directly from the data source, or web server of Fuchs, are required by the claim, but is instead supplied by a user of the computing device. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submit that independent claim 1, in its currently amended form, distinguishes over the Fuchs reference and that it is now in condition for allowance.

8233-12.WAM.464014

MAY 21 2007

The remaining claims either depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are allowable at least because claims 1 is allowable for the reasons provided above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-16 under 35 USC. 103(a) in view of Snyder is respectfully requested.

CLOSING

It should be understood that the above remarks are not intended to provide an exhaustive basis for patentability or concede the basis for the rejections in the Office Action, but are simply provided to overcome the rejections made in the Office Action in the most expedient fashion.

In conclusion, reconsideration and allowance of this application is requested in view of the remarks made herein. Specifically, claims 1-16 are now in condition for allowance. If there are any outstanding issues, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone for their resolution.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Charles J. Meyer  
Reg. No. 41,996  
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty,  
McNett & Henry LLP  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137  
(317) 634-3456